

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 14, 2009, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Status of the Claims

Claims 46-51 (including the second instance of claim 46 from the previous Response) have been renumbered as claims 47-52, respectively. Claims 1, 19, 37, 39, 40, 44 and 52 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. New claims 53-63 have been added. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-63 are currently pending in the application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Claim Objections

On pages 4 and 5, the Office Action objected to claims 46-52 for informalities. Specifically, the Office Action indicated that claims 46-51 have two instances of claim 46 and requested that Applicants submit the claims in the appropriate order. Applicants have appropriately renumbered the claims herein in compliance with MPEP § 608.01(j) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.126.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome and respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chaney et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0108000) in view of Jonsson (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,613). The Office Action took the position on pages 5-11 that the combination of Chaney et al. and Jonsson teaches all of the features of the rejected claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1, from which claims 2-18 and 38 depend, recites a method including receiving at least one registration request to register a user requesting a service in a network entity in an internet protocol multimedia core network subsystem of a communication system and providing the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on a plurality of simultaneous registrations. The control information indicates a restriction on a number of different contact addresses that can be simultaneously registered using a single public user identity. The method also includes controlling the registration based on the control information.

Independent claim 19, from which claims 20-31 depend, recites a system including a network entity configured to receive at least one request to register a user requesting a service in a network entity in an internet protocol multimedia core network subsystem and a providing unit configured to provide the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on a plurality of simultaneous registrations. The control information indicates a restriction on a number of different contact addresses

that can be simultaneously registered using a single public user identity. The system also includes a controlling unit configured to control the registration based on the control information.

Independent claim 32, from which claims 33-37 depend, recites an apparatus including receiving means for receiving at least one registration request for registration of a user requesting a service in an internet protocol multimedia core network subsystem and receiving control means for receiving control information indicating at least one limitation on a plurality of simultaneous registrations. The control information indicates a restriction on a number of different contact addresses that can be simultaneously registered using a single public user identity. The apparatus also includes controlling means for controlling the registration based on the control information.

Independent claim 39, from which claims 40-52 depend, recites an apparatus including a receiver configured to receive at least one registration request to register a user requesting a service in a network entity in an internet protocol multimedia core network subsystem. The receiver is further configured to receive control information indicating at least one limitation on a plurality of simultaneous registrations. The control information indicates a restriction on a number of different contact addresses that can be simultaneously registered using a single public user identity. The apparatus also includes a controller configured to control the registration based on the control information.

As will be discussed below, Chaney et al. and Jonsson, both individually and in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of the presently pending claims.

Chaney et al. generally discusses “a system and method of providing access to services in a telecommunications network utilizing the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)” (paragraph [0002]).

The present [alleged] invention provides a system and method for a service node in a telecommunications network to generically register itself as having specified service types, and having certain capabilities associated with the types of services that it offers. A modified Presence and Instant Messaging (PIM) server then provides this service capability information to users who subscribe to the service. In this way, the user is provided access to a service when the user does not know the network ID of the server providing the service.

(Paragraph [0012] of Chaney et al.).

Jonsson generally discusses “a method and system for enabling a plurality of mobile phone users to share a common subscription which includes certain limitations on the services available to the members of the mobile telephone user group sharing that subscription” (column 1, lines 9-13). Jonsson discusses:

providing a group subscriber telephone service in a mobile radio telephone system in which the subscriber group has a system identity and each of the separate members of the group each have separate system identities. Access to the system by individual members of the group include restrictions which are a function of the nature of the group subscription parameters determined by the system operator selected by the group. For example, members of the group may be restricted to a discrete number (one or more) of communication channels.

(Column 2, lines 48-58).

Independent claim 1 recites, in part, “said control information indicating a restriction on a number of different contact addresses that can be simultaneously registered using a single public user identity”. Independent claims 19, 32 and 39, which

each have their own scope, recite similar features. The Office Action conceded on page 6 that Chaney et al. does not disclose these features. Rather, the Office Action took the position on pages 4 and 6 that Jonsson et al. teaches these features. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In the rejection, the Office Action cited column 3, line 59, through column 4, line 4, column 4, lines 28-36, column 7, line 13, through column 8, line 4 and column 6, lines 27-48, of Jonsson. Specifically, the Office Action stated on page 4 that “the system *limits the number of traffic channels which can be used simultaneously by the members of the group for either outgoing or incoming calls to a predetermined number of channels (members of the group can be simultaneously registered).*” However, Applicants note that the cited sections of Jonsson discuss channels and there is no disclosure of registrations (see, for example, column 4, lines 29-36). The discussion in the cited sections of Jonsson lends itself to the interpretation that there is **no limit** for registrations, but registered contacts can use only a limited number (such as a maximum of 3) channels simultaneously. Accordingly, while everyone cannot call simultaneously if this number of contacts is exceeded, more contacts can still be registered. Further, the introduction of a channel limit in Jonsson leads to the logical conclusion that more contacts can be registered than there are channels, or else such a limitation would be unnecessary.

In the context of Jonsson, it is clear that “channels” are radio traffic channels for transmitting user plane data, which are critical resources in a radio access network. However, this has nothing to do with the number of registrations of different contacts per

each user identity. Further, Jonsson does not include any words pertaining to registration, except in the discussion of prior U.S. Patent Application No. 08/585,149. Accordingly, Jonsson not only fails to teach or suggest that there is a restriction on a number of different contact addresses that can be simultaneously registered using a single public user identity, but Jonsson further teaches away from providing such limitations since more registrations are allowed than channels.

Claims 2-18, 20-31, 33-38 and 40-52 depend from independent claims 1, 19, 32 or 39 and add further features thereto. Thus, the arguments above with respect to the independent claims also apply to the dependent claims.

Per the above, Chaney et al. and Jonsson, both individually and in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of the above-rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome and respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 53-63 have been added. Method claims 53-63, which each have their own scope, recite similar features to apparatus claims 39, 40 and 44-52, respectively. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the new claims patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claims.

Conclusion


For at least the reasons presented above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-63, comprising all of the currently pending claims, patentably distinguish over the cited

art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, Applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,


for Michael A. Leonard II
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 60,180

P.E.G. NO. 59,326

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

MAL:jf:skl